



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/085,755	05/27/1998	FRAMPTON ERROLL ELLIS, III	GNC12US	7351

47604 7590 03/30/2006

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US LLP  
P. O. BOX 9271  
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/085,755

Applicant(s)

ELLIS, III, FRAMPTON ERROLL

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-22 and 25-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 9-22 and 25-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2153

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's argument filed 1/12/06 with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112 first rejection of claims 31, 62, and 74 is persuasive. The 112 first rejection is withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/12/06 with respect to the 35 U.S.C 103 rejection have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the examiner used multiple prior art references from vastly different area of the computer field, incompatible technology and hindsight reconstruction of the claims. The argument is not persuasive because any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In the rejection, the examiner cited specific motivations from the references themselves. Reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without

Art Unit: 2153

more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention.

See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant argued that Besemer does not teach a firewall. Applicant argued that Besemer was filed in 1978, well before the Internet or firewalls were utilized. The argument is not persuasive because claims 9, 42 and 74 merely recite the computer including "at least one firewall" without any further elaboration of the function of the firewall. Applicant has not pointed out to any specific definition of 'firewall' in the specification. The Examiner is permitted to apply a general meaning of a term unless the specification defines otherwise. 'Firewall' in computer science generally means a security scheme to prevent unauthorized access to/from a network. (See firewall definition from The American Heritage College Dictionary, 4th ed.). Even though the term firewall came into popular usage during the time the Internet came on the scene, it does not follow that 'firewall' only exist inside of the Internet context.

Besemer teaches a network of computers for shared processing that make use of idle processor (see abstract - "multiple number of processors or computer systems are connected ...", "the network will choose the processor which is 'idle' ... for processing of a received command and message.") Besemer specifically disclose a security scheme for prevent unauthorized

Art Unit: 2153

access to memory from processor over the network (see col.19 lines 38-46, col.20 lines 47-60, col.59 lines 15-34). Hence, even though Besemer does not use the term 'firewall' per se, Besemer security scheme meets the general definition of a 'firewall'.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-22, 25-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertazzi et al. US patent 5,889,989 and further in view of

Hortensius et al., US patent 5,917,629;

Wade et al., US patent 5,872,987;

Besemer , US patent 4,245,306;

Glick et al., US patent 5,283,819;

Enmei, US patent 6,067,082;

Jones et al., US patent 5,587,928;

Chung et al., US patent 5,978,829; and

Art Unit: 2153

**EDGE: Work-group Computing Report, "PC Vision: Intel unveils plans to bring PCs to vehicles."**

**Regenold, "A single-chip multiprocessor DSP solution for communications applications;"**

As per claim 9, Robertazzi teaches a system comprising:

at least one server computer (col.4 line 15-16, controller computer 103) connected to the Internet (col.1 lines 59-63);

at least two personal computers (col.3 lines 1-20) connected to the server computer through a network (fig.1A);

the server computer having mechanism to function in shared processing operation involving at least two personal computers (col.4 lines 10-35 -load sharing).

Robertazzi does not teach the personal computers are connected via wireless network. Hortensius discloses a system for integrate a wireless network with a wired network. Hortensius discloses that wireless local area network which facilitate direct coupling of to PC's are well known in the art at the time of the invention [see col.1 lines 21-25]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use wireless network system such as that taught by Hortensius because it would have provided low cost mobile computers connection and compatibility with wired network [Hortensius col. lines 19-36].

Art Unit: 2153

Robertazzi does not teach the personal computers having a microchip with at least one microprocessor, a control unit and at least two processing units. However, Robertazzi discloses that various processor may be used for load sharing including super computer [see col.3 lines 1-20]. In the field of super computer, Wade teaches a computer with plural processing units and a controller to control the processing units [see abstract lines 1-5, col.1 lines 38-45]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use a computer of Wade with Robertazzi system because it would have provided large amount of processing power available for load sharing. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the units on a microchip because it would have provided a compact computer system.

Robertazzi does not teach the microchip including a power management component. Power management on an Integrated circuit is well known in the art. Regenold teaches a semiconductor circuit with power management to save power consumption (page 439 col.2 5th paragraph). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate power management in the microchip because it would have enabled low power consumption.

Robertazzi does not teach the personal computer (PC) include a telephone component. It is well known that PC has telephone

Art Unit: 2153

component (e.g. modem). Enmei and Glick teach a multimedia computer having telephone component voice and data communications. Hence, it is inherent that the PC of Robertazzi would have a telephone component. It would have been obvious to have a telephone component because it would have enabled the user to make voice, fax calls.

Robertazzi does not teach the PC including a firewall. In similar field of sharing computer resources over a network, Besemer teaches firewall for regulating access to hardware from another computer (col.1 lines 45-59, col.19 lines 38-46, col.20 lines 47-60, col.59 lines 15-34). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have a firewall to protect the PC from malicious or unauthorized access.

As per claims 11 and 19, Robertazzi does not specifically disclose the server functions to provide network access by the PC. Robertazzi discloses the server computer (controller) can be any computer on the network [col.4 lines 12-20]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to put the Robertazzi's controller function in an Internet access server because it would have provided the controller with information on computers that are online so as to enable the controller to better distribute the processing jobs.



Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 10 and 12-14, Robertazzi does not teach the PC having a camera, videocam, radio or TV component. The type of device equipped with the PC would have been a matter of design choice. Glick teaches a multimedia computer having radio, and TV (see abstract). It is known at the time of the invention to provide PC with camera (see Jones US patent 5,587,928). Hence, it would have been obvious to provide the PC with a camera or videocam, radio, TV or other multimedia devices because it would have provided a full multimedia capable computer.

As per claims 15 and 16, official notice is taken that it is well known in the art to have flash memory (for example BIOS) and hard drive in a PC. It is inherent that PC of Robertazzi would have had some flash memory and hard drive.

As per claim 17, Robertazzi does not specifically disclose the PC include DSP. Regenold discloses a multiprocessor including DSP processing units for communication applications (see fig.1). Hence, it would have been obvious in Robertazzi as modified to have at least one of the processing units being a DSP so as to alleviate the main processor from signal processing jobs.

As per claim 18, Robertazzi disclose usage over Internet (i.e. World wide web). (See col.1 lines 55-60).

As per claims 20-21, Robertazzi does not specifically disclose optical network connection. It is well known that optical

Art Unit: 2153

provides high bandwidth connection. Hence, it would have been obvious to have an optical network connection so as to provide high bandwidth.

As per claim 22, Robertazzi does not specifically disclose the type of media for connecting the computers. It would have been obvious to enable wireless connection from the PC to the server because it would have enabled the PC to be mobile.

As per claim 25, Robertazzi does not specifically disclose the PC being an equipment of an automobile or other conveyance. The PC vision article discloses integration of PC into automobiles. Obviously the PC would be idle while the vehicle is not being used. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to include PC in automobile or other conveyance in the load sharing system of Robertazzi because it would have increase the processing power available for sharing.

As per claim 26, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 17 above. It would have been obvious to including network communication component and the DSP on the microchip because it would have provided an integrated computer on a chip and thereby provided a compact computer system.

As per claim 27, the references teaches parallel and multiprocessing and multitasking (Robertazzi col.2 lines 67, Wade col.3 lines 55-68).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 28, Wade teaches usage of two or more processing unit on the chip to perform parallel processing (see col.3 lines 55-68).

As per claim 29, Robertazzi does not disclose a transponder to determine location of the computer. Enmei discloses a computer with various components including a GPS for determining the location of the computer relative to other user (see abstract). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include a GPS transponder in the computer because it would have provided location information for emergency services and facilitating the locating of nearby computers for share processing.

As per claim 30, Robertazzi does not specifically disclose the user retains preemptive control of the computer. It is well known that load sharing of PC is only permitted when the PC is idle or when permitted by the user. In similar load sharing art, Chung teaches yielding the sharing when a primary user is using the PC so as not to inconvenience the primary user (see Abstract). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to permit the user to have preemptive control of his PC so as to enable the user to make full use of his PC when he is using the PC.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 31, Wade teaches providing N numbers of processing units. Wade does not specifically disclose N being 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128, 256, 512, or 1024 processing units. It is well known that computer system operate natively in binary - e.g. in power of two. It would have been obvious to provide the number of processing units in increments of power of two because it would have simplified connections and control of the processing units to byte units.

As per claim 32, Wade and Regenold teach including RAM on the microchip (see fig.1 of Regenold and Wade).

As per claim 33, Glick teaches the PC having graphic component, audio (fig.1), video processing (fig.17), and flash BIOS (inherent in the PC). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to integrate the various components on a microchip because it would have provided a compact full multimedia computer.

As per claim 34, it would have been obvious to use wireless connection between the server and the PC because it would have enable the PC and/or the server to be mobile.

As per claim 35, Glick teaches operating the PC via a wireless controller (fig.1).

Art Unit: 2153

As per claim 36, it would have been obvious to provide the firewall on the microchip because it would have provided build-in default protection for the computer.

As per claims 37-41, Robertazzi teaches the computer cooperates with another computer (load sharing). Besemer teaches firewall for regulating access to hardware from another computer (col.1 lines 45-59). Hence, it is apparent that the firewall is capable of permitting or denying access to various components of the PC accordingly to a configuration or setting by the user. Besemer teaches the firewall includes hardware (col.20 lines 47-60 "Access control registers").

As per claim 75, Besemer teaches the firewall encloses only a portion of the computer resources (memory).

As per claims 42-73 and 76, they are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 9-22, 25-41, and 75 above.

As per claim 74, it is rejected under similar rationales as for claims 9 + 20 + 31 above.

#### **Conclusion**

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this

Art Unit: 2153

action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (571) 272-3949.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

